



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,390	12/22/2000	Tony Mark	871.0011 USU	1123
29683 7590 10/27/2008 HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC 4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202 SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			EXAMINER DAO, MINH D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/745,390	Applicant(s) MARK ET AL.	
	Examiner MINH D. DAO	Art Unit 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-9,11,13-15,17 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-9,11,13-15,17 and 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 07/21/08 with respect to newly amended independent claims 1, 7,13,15,and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3,5, 7-9,11,13-15,17,19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park (US 6,687,518) in view of Halperin et al. (US 6,115,616) , Komaki (US 4,640,994) and further in view of Pilder et al. (US 5,625,338).

Regarding claim 1, Park teaches a mobile station (see fig. 1; col. 23, lines 24-27), comprising: a communication part that comprises a controller (see fig. 1, the GMPSC system; col. 3, lines 1-11), an RF transceiver (see fig. 5, RF terminal 130; col. 7, lines 16-18) and an antenna (see fig. 6, antenna 410); and a information entry part comprising a keypad or keyboard module that is detachable from said communication part and that is coupled, whether attached or detached, through a wireless link to said

Art Unit: 2618

communication part for conveying keystroke information from said information entry part to said communication part (see figs. 2 and 3; col. 3, lines 39-46; col. 3, lines 57-67; col. 4, lines 42-48). However, Park does not mention that the information entry part is self-powered. Halperin, in an analogous art, teaches this limitation (col. 4, lines 13-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the keypad that uses a Lithium thin film battery of Halperin to in order to minimize the space occupied by the power source as taught by Halperin.

Still regarding claim 1, Halperin, as mentioned above, teaches a self-powered information entry part using Lithium thin film battery, but does not disclose that the self-powered information entry part is configured to be solely by a power generating apparatus. Komaki, in an analogous art, teaches an electronic calculator using a flat panel keyboard solely powered by a solar cell (see fig. 3, col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to replace the Lithium thin film battery of Halperin with the solar cell of Komaki in order to in order to obtain a solely solar cell power source that would not require any replacement for the purpose of cost saving.

Still regarding claim 1, Halperin and Komaki fail to disclose that the keypad or keyboard having a display. Pilder teaches a wireless keypad having a display that displays input information inputted by a user. The wireless keypad of Pilder is also capable of

Art Unit: 2618

transmitting and receiving information (see figs. 1,2; col. 3, line 3 to col. 10, line 20. Also see claim 1 of Pilder). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the self-power information entry of Halperin using the display of Pilder in order for user to visualize inputted characters as taught by Pilder.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of the teachings of Halperin, Park, and Komaki teaches a mobile station as in claim 1, wherein said wireless link is comprised of an RF link (see reference Park, col. 3, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of the teachings of Halperin, Park, and Komaki teaches a mobile station as in claim 1, wherein said wireless link is comprised of a Bluetooth link (see reference Park, col. 3, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 7, the claim has a limitation as that of claim 1, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 8, the claim has a limitation as that of claim 2, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 9, the claim has a limitation as that of claim 3, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Regarding claim 13, the claim has a limitation as that of claim 1, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 15, the claim, as mentioned above, has the limitations of claim 1 that are taught by the combination of Park and Halperin. However, Park and Halperin do not mention a solar cell solely powers the self-powered information entry part. Komaki, in an analogous art, teaches an electronic calculator using a flat panel keyboard solely powered by a solar cell (see fig. 3, col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to replace the Lithium thin film battery of Halperin with the solar cell of Komaki in order to in order to obtain a solely solar cell power source that would not require any replacement for the purpose of cost saving.

Regarding claim 5, the combination of the teachings of Halperin, Park, and Komaki teaches a mobile station as in claim 4, wherein said source is comprised of at least one solar cell (see reference Halperin, col. 4, lines 13-18; reference Komaki, fig. 3, col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 9).

Regarding claim 11, the claim has a limitation as that of claim 5, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 14, the combination of the teachings of Halperin, Park, and Komaki teaches a method as in claim 13, and further comprising a step of powering said keypad module using a solar cell located on said keypad module (see reference Halperin, col. 4, lines 13-18; reference Little, lines 51-60).

Regarding claim 17, the claim has a limitation as that of claim 15, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 15.

Regarding claim 19, the combination of the teachings of Halperin, Park, and Komaki teaches an information entry module as in claim 17, wherein said wireless link is a uni-directional link (see reference Halperin, col. 3, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of the teachings of Halperin, Park, and Komaki teaches an information entry module as in claim 17, wherein said wireless link is a bi-directional link (see reference Halperin, col. 3, lines 57-67).

Regarding claims 21,22, and 23, the combination of the teachings of Halperin, Park, Komaki and Pilder teaches that the keypad module is further configured to receive information from the communication part over the wireless link and to display the information received from the communication part on the display of the keypad module (see Pilder, figs. 1,2; col. 3, line 3 to col. 10, line 20. Also see claim 1 of Pilder).

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment filed 07/21/08 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH D. DAO whose telephone number is (571)272-7851. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW ANDERSON can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MINH DAO
/MINH D DAO/
Examiner, Art Unit 2618